arXiv:1301.3940v1 [math.PR] 16 Jan 2013

Exact separation phenomenon for the eigenvalues of large Information-Plus-Noise type matrices Application to spiked models

M. Capitaine*

Abstract

We consider large Information-Plus-Noise type matrices of the form $M_N = (\sigma \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}} + A_N)(\sigma \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}} + A_N)^*$ where X_N is an $n \times N$ ($n \leq N$) matrix consisting of independent standardized complex entries, A_N is an $n \times N$ nonrandom matrix and $\sigma > 0$. As N tends to infinity, if $n/N \to c \in]0, 1]$ and if the empirical spectral measure of $A_N A_N^*$ converges weakly to some compactly supported probability distribution $\nu \neq \delta_0$, Dozier and Silverstein established in [11] that almost surely the empirical spectral measure of M_N converges weakly towards a nonrandom distribution $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. In [2], Bai and Silverstein proved, under certain assumptions on the model, that for some closed interval in $]0; +\infty[$ outside the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ satisfying some conditions involving A_N, almost surely, no eigenvalues of M_N will appear in this interval for all N large. In this paper, we carry on with the study of the support of the limiting spectral measure previously investigated in [12] and later in [14, 15] and we show that, under the same assumptions as in [2], there is an exact separation phenomenon between the spectrum of M_N and the spectrum of $A_N A_N^*$: to a gap in the spectrum of M_N pointed out by Bai and Silverstein, it corresponds a gap in the spectrum of $A_N A_N^*$ which splits the spectrum of $A_N A_N^*$ exactly as that of M_N. We use the previous results to characterize the outliers of spiked Information-Plus-Noise type models.

1 Introduction

Let $\{X_{ij}, i \in \mathbb{N}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an infinite set of independent standardized complex entries $(\mathbb{E}(X_{ij}) = 0, \mathbb{E}(|X_{ij}|^2 = 1)$ in some probability space. Define for any nonnull integer numbers $n \leq N$ and $\sigma > 0$, the following matrix

$$M_N = (\sigma \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}} + A_N)(\sigma \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}} + A_N)^* \tag{1.1}$$

---

[*] CNRS, Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, Equipe de Statistique et Probabilités, F-31062 Toulouse Cedex 09. E-mail: mireille.capitaine@math.univ-toulouse.fr

where $X_N = (X_{ij})_{1\leq i\leq n; 1\leq j\leq N}$ and A_N is an $n\times N$ nonrandom matrix. This model is referred in the litterature as the Information-Plus-Noise model. For any Hermitian $n\times n$ matrix Y, denote by

$$\lambda_1(Y) \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n(Y)$$

the ordered eigenvalues of Y and by μ_Y the empirical spectral measure of Y:

$$\mu_Y := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i(Y).$$

For a probability measure τ on $\mathbb{R}$, denote by g_τ its Stieltjes transform defined for $z \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$ by

$$g_\tau(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\tau(x)}{z-x}.$$

As N tends to infinity, if $c_N = n/N \to c \in]0,1]$, if the X_{ij} are i.i.d and if the empirical spectral measure $\mu_{A_N A_N^*}$ of $A_N A_N^*$ converges weakly to some probability distribution $\nu \neq \delta_0$, Dozier and Silverstein established in [11] that almost surely the empirical spectral measure μ_{M_N} of M_N converges weakly towards a nonrandom distribution $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ which is characterized in terms of its Stieljes transform which satisfies the following equation: for any $z\in\mathbb{C}^+$,

$$g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z) = \int \frac{1}{(1-\sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z))z - \frac{t}{1-\sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z)} - \sigma^2(1-c)} d\nu(t). \tag{1.2}$$

Note that, since for any $z\in\mathbb{C}^+$, $\Im(z g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z)) = -\int \frac{t\Im z}{|t-z|^2} d\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}(z) \leq 0$ and $\Im(g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z)) < 0$, one can easily see that the imaginary part of the denominator of the integrand in (1.2) is greater or equal to $\Im z$ so that the integral is well defined. Note also that in [11], the authors proved that the solution m to the equation

$$m(z) = \int \frac{1}{(1-\sigma^2 c m(z))z - \frac{t}{1-\sigma^2 c m(z)} - \sigma^2(1-c)} d\nu(t), \text{for any } z\in\mathbb{C}^+ \tag{1.3}$$

is unique if $\Im m(z) < 0$ and $\Im(zm(z)) \leq 0$ (specifically if m is the Stieljes transform of a probability measure with nonnegative support).

This result of convergence was extended to independent but non identically distributed random variables by Xie in [16].

In [12], Dozier and Silverstein investigated this limiting spectral measure $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ and proved in particular that its distribution function is continuous (it has a continuous derivative on $\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ and no mass at zero).

The support of the probability measure $\mu_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}$ (that is the measure whose Stieljes transform satisfies (1.2) where ν is replaced by $\mu_{A_N A_N^*}$ and c by c_N) plays a fundamental role in the study of the spectrum of M_N (see [2, 14, 15]). Introducing, for any probability measure τ on $[0,+\infty[$ and any $0<\gamma\leq 1$, $\sigma>0$, the function $\omega_{\sigma,\tau,\gamma}$ defined in $\mathbb{R}\setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\tau,\gamma})$ by

$$\omega_{\sigma,\tau,\gamma}(x) = x(1-\sigma^2\gamma g_{\mu_{\sigma,\tau,\gamma}}(x))^2 - \sigma^2(1-\gamma)(1-\sigma^2\gamma g_{\mu_{\sigma,\tau,\gamma}}(x))$$

Bai and Silverstein established the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *[2] Assume that*

1. $X_{ij}, i, j = 1, 2, \ldots$ *are independent standardized random variables.*
2. *There exists a* K *and a random variable* X *with finite fourth moment such that, for any* $x > 0$
$$\frac{1}{n_1 n_2} \sum_{i \leq n_1, j \leq n_2} P\left(|X_{ij}| > x\right) \leq K P\left(|X| > x\right)$$
for any n_1, n_2.
3. *There exists a positive function* $\Psi(x) \uparrow \infty$ *as* $x \to \infty$ *and* $M > 0$ *such that*
$$\max_{ij} E|X_{ij}^2| \Psi\left(|X_{ij}^2|\right) \leq M.$$
4. $\|A_N\|$ *is uniformly bounded.*
5. *As* N *tends to infinity,* $c_N = n/N \to c \in]0, 1]$
6. *The empirical spectral measure* $\mu_{A_N A_N^*}$ *of* $A_N A_N^*$ *converges weakly to some probability distribution* $\nu \neq \delta_0$.
7. *Let* $[a, b]$ *be such that the couple* $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ *of the following properties is satisfied:*
    - *(i) there exists* $0 < \delta < a$ *such that for all large* N, $]a - \delta; b + \delta[\subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma, \mu_{\mathrm{A_N A_N^*}}, \mathrm{c_N}})$
    - *(ii)* A_{Nj} *denoting the matrix resulting from removing the* j*-th column from* A_N*, there exists* $0 < \tau < \delta$ *and a positive* $d < 1$ *such that for all* N *large, the number of* j*'s with no eigenvalues of* $N/(N-1) A_{Nj} A_{Nj}^*$ *appearing in* $\omega_{\sigma, \mu_{A_N A_N^*}, c_N}(]a - \tau, b + \tau[)$ *is greater that* N^{1-d}.

Then
$$\mathbb{P}[\textit{for all large } N, \mathrm{spect(M_N)} \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{[a, b]}] = 1.$$

Remark 1.1. *Since* $\mu_{\sigma, \mu_{A_N A_N^*}, c_N}$ *converges weakly towards* $\mu_{\sigma, \nu, c}$ *(this can be deduced from [11] and Theorem 1 in [15]), Assumption 7. (i) implies that* $\forall 0 < \tau < \delta$, $[a - \tau; b + \tau] \subset^c \mathrm{supp}\ \mu_{\sigma, \nu, c}$.

Note that such a result was proved by a different approach in [14] when the X_{ij} are independent gaussian variables without assuming condition (ii) of 7. in Theorem 1.1. Note that when the X_{ij} are independent gaussian variables, it can be assumed that A_N is diagonal and, then, condition (ii) of 7. in Theorem 1.1 is not needed.

In [15], dealing with independent gaussian variables X_{ij}, P. Loubaton and P. Vallet established an exact separation phenomenon between the spectrum of M_N and the spectrum of $A_N A_N^*$: to a gap in the spectrum of M_N, it corresponds a gap in the spectrum of $A_NA_N^*$ which splits the spectrum of A_N exactly as that of M_N. In this paper, we extend their result to the framework of non gaussian Information-Plus-Noise type matrices investigated in [2] since we establish the following

Theorem 1.2. *Assume conditions [1-7] of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied and that moreover, if $c < 1$, $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) > 0$. Then for N large enough,*

$$\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}([a,b]) = [\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b)] \subset^c supp(\mu_{A_NA_N^*}).$$

With the convention that $\lambda_0(M_N) = \lambda_0(A_NA_N^*) = +\infty$ and $\lambda_{N+1}(M_N) = \lambda_{N+1}(A_N^*) = -\infty$, for N large enough, let $i_N \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$ be such that

$$\lambda_{i_N+1}(A_NA_N^*) < \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) \quad and \quad \lambda_{i_N}(A_NA_N^*) > \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b). \tag{1.4}$$

Then

$$P[for\ all\ large\ N, \lambda_{i_N+1}(M_N) < a\ and\ \lambda_{i_N}(M_N) > b] = 1.$$

Remark 1.2. *We will prove in Proposition 2.2 that, if $c < 1$, the minimum of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ is strictly positive. Let us denote by x_0 this minimum. We will see that if $a \in [0; +\infty[\setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$ is not included in $[0; x_0[$, then $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) > 0$. Nevertheless this is not a necessary condition for $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) > 0$ to hold as we will point out in Remark 3.1.*

The technics of [15] completely differ from the approach used in the present paper which uses an argument similar to [9] which consists in introducing a continuum of matrices between $A_NA_N^*$ and M_N. Before using this approach, we carry on with the study of the support of the limiting spectral measure previously investigated in [12] and later in [14, 15]. The main results about the limiting spectral measure can be summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *Let c be in $]0; 1]$, σ be in $]0; +\infty[$ and ν be a compactly supported probability measure on $[0; +\infty[$. Define differentiable functions $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ and $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ on respectively $\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$ and $\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\nu)$ by setting*

$$\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c} : \begin{array}{l} \mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \to \mathbb{R} \\ x \mapsto x(1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x))^2 - \sigma^2(1-c)(1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x)) \end{array}$$

and

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c} : \begin{array}{l} \mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\nu) \to \mathbb{R} \\ x \mapsto x(1 + c\sigma^2 g_\nu(x))^2 + \sigma^2(1-c)(1 + c\sigma^2 g_\nu(x)) \end{array}.$$

Set

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\nu), \Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) > 0, g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} \right\}.$$

We have the following results.

A) If $c < 1$ then $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$.
If $c = 1$,

a) If $0 \in \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ *then* $0 \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1})$.

b) If $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ *and if* $g_\nu(0) \leq -\frac{1}{\sigma^2}$ *then* $0 \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1})$.

c) If $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ *and if* $g_\nu(0) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2}$ *then* $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1})$.

B) 1. $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ *is a homeomorphism from* $\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$ *onto* $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ *with inverse* $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}$.

2. $\omega'_{\sigma,\nu,c} > 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$.

C) For any $y > x$ *in* $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$, $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(y) > \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)$.
For any $y > x$ *in* $\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$, $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(y) > \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)$.

D) Assume that the support of ν *has a finite number of connected components. Then there exists a nonnul integer number* p *and* $u_1 < v_1 < u_2 < \ldots < u_p < v_p$ *(depending on* σ, ν, c*) such that*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} =]-\infty; u_1[\cup_{l=1}^{p-1}]v_l; u_{l+1}[\cup]v_p; +\infty[.$$

We have

$$supp(\nu) \subset \cup_{l=1}^{p} [u_l; v_l]$$

and for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $[u_l; v_l] \cap supp(\nu) \neq \emptyset$.

Moreover,

$$supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) = \cup_{l=1}^{p} [\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l^-); \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)],$$

with

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_1^+) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_2^-) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_2^+) < \cdots < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_p^-) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_p^+),$$

where $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l^-) = \lim_{u \uparrow u_l} \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)$ *and* $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+) = \lim_{u \downarrow v_l} \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)$.

Note that choosing a matricial model as introduced in Section 4 but without spikes, it is easy to deduce from Theorem 1.2, Proposition 4.1, Theorem 4.1 A) and the weak convergence almost surely of the spectral measures the following

Corollary 1.1. *Assume that the support of* ν *has a finite number of connected components. Let* $[u_l, v_l]$ *be a connected component of* $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$*, then*

$$\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}([\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l^-), \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)]) = \nu([u_l, v_l]).$$

The previous Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 allow us to investigate the spectrum of spiked models when the perturbation matrix is diagonal and to obtain in Theorem 4.2 a description of the convergence of the eigenvalues of M_N depending on the location of the spikes of the perturbation with respect to $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ and to the connected components of the support of ν. This extends a previous result in [15] involving the Gaussian case and finite rank perturbations.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3. Theorem 1.2 is proved in Section 3. Section 4 investigates the spectrum of spiked models.

2 The support of the limiting spectral measure

In this section, we split the results of Theorem 1.3 into different propositions that we prove successively. Firstly, we are going to take up the arguments and results of [12] that we will develop here for the reader's convenience in order to state in Proposition 2.1 the characterization of the complement in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. Secondly, in Proposition 2.2, we establish necessary and sufficient conditions for the inclusion of zero in the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. these results allow us to put foward a complete characterization of the complement of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ in $\mathbb{R}$ in Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4. Thirdly, in Proposition 2.5, we establish a relationship between the complement of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ and the complement of the support of $\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}$ and in Proposition 2.6, we prove that $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ is globally increasing on the set $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. When the support of ν has a finite number of connected components, these results allow us to deduce a description of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ in Proposition 2.7 in terms of a finite union of closed disjoint intervals.

Actually it is possible to deduce from results of [12] the following characterization of the complement of $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}$ and the following relationships between $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ and $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}$.

Proposition 2.1.

- *(i)* $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})\cup\{0\}\}$, *we have* $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) \in \mathbb{R}\setminus supp(\nu), \omega^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) > 0$, $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > 0$, $g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$ *and*
$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) = x. \tag{2.1}$$
- *(ii)* $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}\setminus supp(\nu)$ *such that* $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) > 0$ *and* $g_\nu(x) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$, *we have* $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) \in \mathbb{R}\setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$ *and*
$$\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}\left(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right) = x. \tag{2.2}$$
- *(iii) Therefore*
$$\mathbb{R}\setminus\{supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})\cup\{0\}\} =$$
$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}\left\{u \in \mathbb{R}\setminus supp(\nu), \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) \neq 0, \Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) > 0, g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}\right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof: (1.2) may be rewritten, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$,

$$\frac{g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z)}{1-\sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z)} = g_\nu\left[z(1-\sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z))^2 - \sigma^2(1-c)(1-\sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z))\right] \tag{2.4}$$

According to Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.1 in [12], for any x in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, one has $\lim_{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \to x} g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z) := g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x)$ exists and

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\},\ \Re(\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} - g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z)) > 0 \tag{2.5}$$

and according to Theorem 3.2 in [12],

$$\text{if } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\} \text{ then } \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\nu). \tag{2.6}$$

Therefore it makes sense to let $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ tend to $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\}$ in (2.4) and get for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\}$,

$$\frac{g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x)}{1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x)} = g_\nu\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right). \tag{2.7}$$

Multiplying both sides of (2.7) by $\sigma^2 c$ and adding 1, it readily comes that

$$\frac{1}{1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x)} = 1 + \sigma^2 c g_\nu\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right) \tag{2.8}$$

and then

$$1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x) = \frac{1}{1 + \sigma^2 c g_\nu\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right)}. \tag{2.9}$$

Replacing $1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x)$ in the expression of $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)$ by the right hand side of (2.9), it follows that

$$\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) = \frac{x}{\left(1 + \sigma^2 c g_\nu\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right)\right)^2} - \frac{\sigma^2(1-c)}{\left(1 + \sigma^2 c g_\nu\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right)\right)}$$

and finally that

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) = x \tag{2.10}$$

Hence any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\}$ can be written as $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)$ where $u = \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\nu)$. Let us prove that $\omega'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) > 0$, $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > 0$ and $g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$. By differentiating both sides of (2.8) we obtain that for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\}$

$$\frac{g'_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x)}{(1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x))^2} = \omega'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) g'_\nu\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right). \tag{2.11}$$

Therefore since $g'_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x) < 0$ and $g'_\nu\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right) < 0$ we can deduce that

$$\text{for any } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\}, \omega'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) > 0. \tag{2.12}$$

Now by differentiating both sides of (2.10) we obtain that

$$\text{for any } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\}, \Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > 0. \tag{2.13}$$

Let us prove now that

$$\text{for } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\}, g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}. \tag{2.14}$$

According to Lemma 2.1 (c) in [12] , $g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x) < \frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$. Moreover $y \mapsto \frac{y}{1-\sigma^2 cy}$ is strictly increasing from $]-\infty; \frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}[$ onto $]-\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}; +\infty[$. The result readily follows using (2.7). Hence, we have proved the inclusion

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus \{\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\} \subset$$
$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}\left\{u \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\nu), \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) \neq 0, \Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) > 0, g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}\right\}.$$

Now let u be in $\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathrm{supp}(\nu), \Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) > 0, g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$. Following [12] let us prove that $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)$ belongs to $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\}\}$ and $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)) = u$. Let $]l_1; l_2[\subset [L_1; L_2] \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ such that $u \in]l_1; l_2[$ and for any $v \in]l_1; l_2[$, $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v) > 0, g_\nu(v) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$. g_ν is stricly decreasing on $]l_1; l_2[$ and maps $]l_1; l_2[$ onto some interval $]d_1; d_2[\subset]-\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}; +\infty[$. $h : b \mapsto \frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}\left(\frac{1}{b} - 1\right)$ is a strictly decreasing function from $]0; +\infty[$ onto $]-\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}; +\infty[$. Hence there is an interval $]k_1; k_2[\subset]0; +\infty[$ such that h is a one-to-one correspondence from $]k_1; k_2[$ to $]d_1; d_2[$. Therefore $g_\nu^{-1} \circ h$ is is a one-to-one correspondence from $]k_1; k_2[$ to $]l_1; l_2[$. For any v in $]l_1; l_2[$, there exists a unique k in $]k_1; k_2[$ such that $v = g_\nu^{-1}(h(k))$; then $k = k(v) = h^{-1}(g_\nu(v)) = \frac{1}{1+\sigma^2 c g_\nu(v)}$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} p(k) &:= \frac{1}{k^2} g_\nu^{-1}(h(k)) + \frac{1}{k}\sigma^2(1-c) \\ &= (1+\sigma^2 c g_\nu(v))^2 v + (1+\sigma^2 c g_\nu(v))\sigma^2(1-c) \\ &= \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v). \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Differentiating both sides of (2.15) in v we obtain that for any $v \in]l_1; l_2[$, $p'(k(v))k'(v) = \Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v)$ with $k'(v) = -\sigma^2 c \frac{g'_\nu(v)}{(1+\sigma^2 c g_\nu(v))^2} > 0$. Therefore $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v) > 0$ implies $p'(k(v)) > 0$. According to Theorem 3.3 in [12], we can conclude that $p(k(u)) = \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$ and

$$k = 1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(p(k)). \tag{2.16}$$

Moreover (2.16) implies

$$\frac{1}{1+\sigma^2 c g_\nu(u)} = 1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)).$$

It readily follows that

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)(1-\sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u))^2 - \sigma^2(1-c)(1-\sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u))) = u$$

that is $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)) = u$. $\square$

Interpreting $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ as the distribution of a Free Wishart process $FW(\frac{1}{c};\nu)$ introduced in [7] at time $t = \sigma^2 c$ will allow us to establish necessary and sufficient conditions for the inclusion of zero in the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$.

Proposition 2.2. *1. If $c < 1$ then $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,\mathrm{c}})$.*

2. If $c = 1$,

- *a) If $0 \in \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ then $0 \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1})$.*
- *b) If $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ and if $g_\nu(0) \leq -\frac{1}{\sigma^2}$ then $0 \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1})$.*
- *c) If $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ and if $g_\nu(0) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2}$ then $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1})$.*

Proof: Choosing gaussian entries for X_N, It is easy to see that $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ is the distribution of a Free Wishart process $FW(\frac{1}{c};\nu)$ introduced in [7] at time $t = \sigma^2 c$ (see Section 2.2 p 421 in [7]).

1. It is proved in Proposition 2.2 in [7] that if $c < 1$, the minimum of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ is strictly positive; therefore $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,\mathrm{c}})$.

2. If $c = 1$, $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1}$ is the distribution of $(Z(\sigma^2)^* + \sqrt{d_0})(Z(\sigma^2) + \sqrt{d_0})$ where Z is a complex free Brownian motion in some W^*-non commutative probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$, d_0 is a a positive operator in $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$ such that $\forall k \geq 0$, $\phi(d_0^k) = \int x^k d\nu(x)$, (see Definition 2.3 in [7]). From Lemma 5.1 of [6], $(Z(\sigma^2)^* + \sqrt{d_0})(Z(\sigma^2) + \sqrt{d_0})$ has the same distribution in $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$ as $(S_{\sigma^2} + a)^2$ where S_{σ^2} is a centered semi-circular variable with variance σ^2 and a is a symmetrically variable which is free with S_{σ^2} such that $\phi(a^{2k}) = \int x^k d\nu(x)$. Let us denote by τ the distribution of a; τ is the symmetrization [1] of the pushforward of ν by the map $t \mapsto \sqrt{t}$. Then, denoting by $\mu_{sc}(\sigma)$ the centered semi-circular distribution with variance σ^2, proving 2. of Proposition 2.2 consists in studying if 0 is either in the support of the free convolution $\mu_{sc}(\sigma) \boxplus \tau$ or in its complement. The support of the free convolution of a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mu_{sc}(\sigma)$ has been deeply studied by P. Biane in [5]. Let $U_{\sigma,\tau} := \left\{u \in \mathbb{R}, \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\tau(x)}{(u-x)^2} > \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right\}$. According to (2.4) in [9],

$$\overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}} = \mathrm{supp}(\tau) \cup \{u \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\tau), \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\tau(x)}{(u-x)^2} \geq \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\} \tag{2.17}$$

P. Biane obtained in [5] the following description of the support

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{sc}(\sigma) \boxplus \tau) = H_{\sigma,\tau}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}). \tag{2.18}$$

where

$$H_{\sigma,\tau} : z \longmapsto z + \sigma^2 g_\tau(z).$$

---

[1] The symmetrization of a law μ on $[0; +\infty[$ is the law τ defined by $\tau(A) = \frac{\mu(A)+\mu(-A)}{2}$ for all Borel set A.

Note that since τ is a symmetric distribution, $\overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ is a symmetrical set and

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}},\ H_{\sigma,\tau}(-z) = -H_{\sigma,\tau}(z) \tag{2.19}$$

Therefore, if for some $z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ we have $H_{\sigma,\tau}(z) = 0$ then $H_{\sigma,\tau}(-z) = H_{\sigma,\tau}(z)$. Since $H_{\sigma,\tau}$ is globally strictly increasing on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ (see Remark 2.1 in [9]), we can deduce that if $z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ satisfies $H_{\sigma,\tau}(z) = 0$ it must be equal to zero. It follows that, according to (2.18), if $0 \in \overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$, then $0 \notin \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{sc}(\sigma) \boxplus \tau)$. Since 0 belongs to $\overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ if and only if either 0 belongs to $\operatorname{supp}(\tau)$ (or equivalently $0 \in \operatorname{supp}(\nu)$) or $0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\nu)$ and $\int \frac{d\tau(x)}{x^2} = \int \frac{1}{x} d\nu(x) = -g_\nu(0) \geq \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$, a) and b) follow.
If $0 \notin \overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ which means that $0 \notin \operatorname{supp}(\nu)$ and $g_\nu(0) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2}$, (2.19) yields $H_{\sigma,\tau}(0) = 0$ and then, (2.18) implies that $0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{sc}(\sigma) \boxplus \tau)$ and c) follows. □

Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2 easily allow to put foward the following complete characterization of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1}$.

Proposition 2.3.

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1}) = \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,1} \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\nu), \Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,1}(u) > 0, g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right\}. \tag{2.20}$$

Now, assume that $c < 1$. According to Proposition 2.2, $0 \notin \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$. Since $z \mapsto \frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} - g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z)$ is strictly increasing on $]-\infty; \min\{x, x \in \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})\}[$ and according to (2.5), $\forall z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $\Re(\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} - g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(z)) > 0$, we can readily deduce that $\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} - g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(0) > 0$ and then

$$\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0) < 0.$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $[-\epsilon; \epsilon] \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$ and $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\epsilon) < 0$. According to Proposition 2.1 (i), we have for any $x \in [-\epsilon; \epsilon] \setminus \{0\}$, $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\nu), \omega'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) > 0$, $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > 0$, $g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$ and $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) = x$. This readily implies that $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\epsilon) > \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0)$ and therefore, since g_ν is strictly decreasing on $]-\infty; \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\epsilon)]$, that

$$g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0)) > g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\epsilon)) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}.$$

Moreover, by continuity, we readily have

$$\forall x \in]-\epsilon; \epsilon[, \quad \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) = x \tag{2.21}$$

and $\omega'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0) \geq 0$ and $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0)) \geq 0$. Now, differentiating both sides of (2.21) at zero yields $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0)) \neq 0$ and $\omega'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0) \neq 0$ and then $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0)) > 0$ and $\omega'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0) > 0$.

Thus, we have $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$, $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\nu), \omega^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) > 0$, $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > 0$, $g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$ and

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) = x.$$

These last results combined with (ii) of Proposition 2.1 lead to the following Proposition.

Proposition 2.4. *For any* $0 < c < 1$,

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) = \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c} \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\nu), \Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) > 0, g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} \right\}.$$

The following lemmas will allow to establish a relationship between the complement of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ and the complement of the support of $\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}$ in Proposition 2.5.

Lemma 2.1. *Recall that* $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\nu), \Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) > 0, g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} \right\}$. *We have for any* $0 < c < 1$, $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}$.

Proof: This readily follows from the fact that $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) = \Phi^{'}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u) + c\sigma^4(1-c)g^{'}_\nu(u)$ and then $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) < \Phi^{'}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u)$. □

Lemma 2.2. *The function K defined by*

$$K(z) = z + \frac{\sigma^2(1-c)}{1 - \sigma^2 c g_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z)}$$

is well defined on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$ *and*

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{E}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}, \quad \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) = K(\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u)). \tag{2.22}$$

Proof: According to (2.5), for any $z \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$, $\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} - g_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z) > 0$. Now, if $0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$, since $\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} - g_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}$ is strictly increasing on $]-\infty; \min\{x, x \in \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})\}[$, we can deduce that $\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} - g_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(0) > 0$. Therefore for any z in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$, $\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} - g_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z) > 0$ and K is well defined. Now, (2.22) readily follows from (2.8), Proposition 2.3 and (2.2) for $u \neq 0$ and may be proved for $u = 0$ whenever $0 \in \mathcal{E}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}$ by a continuity argument. □

Proposition 2.5.

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) = K\left(\left\{\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}), K'(x) > 0\right\}\right).$$

Proof: Let x be in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$. According to Proposition 2.4, there exists $u \in \mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ such that $x = \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)$. According to Lemma 2.1, u belongs to $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}$ and according to (2.22), $x = K(\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u))$. Proposition 2.3 implies that $\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u)$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$. Differentiating both sides of (2.22) leads to

$$\forall v\in\mathcal{E}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1},\quad \Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v)=K^{'}(\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(v))\Phi^{'}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(v). \tag{2.23}$$

Then $K^{'}(\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u))>0$ since $u\in\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}\subset\mathcal{E}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})\subset K\left(\left\{\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}),K'(x)>0\right\}\right).$$

Now, let x be in $\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$ such that $K^{'}(x)>0$. According to Proposition 2.3, there exists u in $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}$ such that $x=\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u)$ and (2.22) implies $K(x)=K(\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u))=\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)$. Now, (2.23) implies that $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)>0$ and then $u\in\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ and, using Proposition 2.4, $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$. Therefore $K\left(\left\{\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}),K'(x)>0\right\}\right)\subset\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$ and the proof is complete. □

The following lemmas will allow us to establish in Proposition 2.6 that $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ is globally increasing on the set $\left\{u\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\nu),\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)>0,g_\nu(u)>-\frac{1}{\sigma^2c}\right\}$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $z_1<z_2$ be in $\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$ such that for $i=1,2$, $K^{'}(z_i)>0$. Then $K(z_1)<K(z_2)$.*

Proof: We have for $i=1,2$,

$$K^{'}(z_i)=1-\frac{\sigma^4(1-c)c}{(1-\sigma^2cg_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z_i))^2}\int\frac{d\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(x)}{(z_i-x)^2}>0.$$

Then

$$\frac{K(z_2)-K(z_1)}{(z_2-z_1)}$$

$$=1-\frac{\sigma^4(1-c)c}{(1-\sigma^2cg_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z_2))(1-\sigma^2cg_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z_1))}\int\frac{d\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(x)}{(z_2-x)(z_1-x)}.$$

Using Cauchy Schwartz inequality we have

$$\frac{\sigma^4(1-c)c}{(1-\sigma^2cg_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z_2))(1-\sigma^2cg_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z_1))}\int\frac{d\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(x)}{(z_2-x)(z_1-x)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \left\{\frac{\sigma^4(1-c)c}{(1-\sigma^2cg_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z_1))^2}\int\frac{d\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(x)}{(z_1-x)^2}\right\}^{\frac12}\left\{\frac{\sigma^4(1-c)c}{(1-\sigma^2cg_{\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}}(z_2))^2}\int\frac{d\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(x)}{(z_2-x)^2}\right\}^{\frac12}\\ &< 1.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $K(z_2)-K(z_1)>0$.□

Proposition 2.6. *For any* $u_2 > u_1$ *in* $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$*,*

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_2) > \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1). \tag{2.24}$$

Proof: Let τ be the symmetrization of the pushforward of ν by the map $t \mapsto \sqrt{t}$. Let u be in $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ such that $u > 0$. Define for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\tau)$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\tau}(x) &= x + \sigma^2 c g_\tau(x) \\ &= x + \sigma^2 c x g_\nu(x^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\sqrt{u}$ is in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\tau)$ and

$$\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u) = (H_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\tau}(\sqrt{u}))^2, \tag{2.25}$$

$$\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) = \sigma^2(1-c)\sigma^2 c g^{'}_\nu(u) + (1+\sigma^2 c g_\nu(u))H^{'}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\tau}(\sqrt{u}).$$

It readily follows that

$$1 - \sigma^2 c \int \frac{d\tau(x)}{(\sqrt{u}-x)^2} = H^{'}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\tau}(\sqrt{u}) > 0. \tag{2.26}$$

Firstly, let $u_2 > u_1 > 0$ be in $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. Then for $i = 1, 2$, $\sqrt{u_i} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\tau)$ and by (2.25) and (2.26), $\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u_i) = (H_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\tau}(\sqrt{u_i}))^2$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\tau}(\sqrt{u_2}) - H_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\tau}(\sqrt{u_1})}{\sqrt{u_2}-\sqrt{u_1}} &= 1 - \sigma^2 c \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\tau(x)}{(\sqrt{u_1}-x)(\sqrt{u_2}-x)} \\ &\geq 1 - \left\{\sigma^2 c \int \frac{d\tau(x)}{(\sqrt{u_1}-x)^2}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{\sigma^2 c \int \frac{d\tau(x)}{(\sqrt{u_2}-x)^2}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since moreover for $i = 1, 2$, $H_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\tau}(\sqrt{u_i}) = \sqrt{u_i}(1 + \sigma^2 c g_\nu(u_i))$ is positive, it follows that

$$\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u_2) > \Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u_1).$$

Secondly, let $u_1 < u_2 < 0$ be in $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. Since $1 + \sigma^2 c g_\nu$ is strictly decreasing on $]-\infty; \min\{x, x \in \operatorname{supp}(\nu)\}[$, we have $\forall u \in]-\infty; u_2]$, $1 + \sigma^2 c g_\nu(u) > 0$ and $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u) = (1+\sigma^2 c g_\nu(u))(2uc\sigma^2 g^{'}_\nu(u) + (1+\sigma^2 c g_\nu(u)))$ is obviously positive, it follows that

$$\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u_2) > \Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u_1).$$

Finally, let $u_1 < 0 < u_2$ be in $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. We have $\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u_2) > 0$ and $\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u_1) < 0$ so that

$$\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u_2) > \Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u_1).$$

Therefore,

$$\forall (u_1, u_2) \in \left(\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} \setminus \{0\}\right)^2, \text{ if } u_1 < u_2, \text{ then } \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,1}(u_2) > \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,1}(u_1). \tag{2.27}$$

Now, (2.23) implies that for any $u \in \mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}$, $K^{'}\left(\Phi_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1}(u)\right) > 0$. It readily follows from (2.22), Lemma 2.3 and (2.27) that

$$\forall (u_1,u_2) \in \left(\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} \setminus \{0\}\right)^2, u_1 < u_2, \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_2) > \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1). \tag{2.28}$$

Assume now that 0 belongs to $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$; then there exists $u_1 < 0 < u_2$ such that $[u_1;u_2] \subset \mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. Since $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c} > 0$ on $[u_1;u_2]$, we have for any u and v in $[u_1;u_2]$ such that $u < 0 < v$, $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v)$. Then, it is easy to generalize (2.28) to (2.24). $\square$

Propositions 2.3 and 2.4, (2.2) and Proposition 2.6 readily yield

Corollary 2.1. *For any $y > x$ in $\mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$, $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(y) > \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)$.*

When the support of ν has a finite number of connected components, we have the following description of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ in terms of a finite union of closed disjoint intervals.

Proposition 2.7. *For any $0 < c \leq 1$, recall that*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} = \left\{u \in \mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\nu), \Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) > 0, g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}\right\}.$$

If the support of ν has a finite number of connected components, there exists a nonnul integer number p and $u_1 < v_1 < u_2 < \ldots < u_p < v_p$ depending on σ, ν, c, such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} =]-\infty; u_1[\cup_{l=1}^{p-1}]v_l; u_{l+1}[\cup]v_p; +\infty[. \tag{2.29}$$

We have

$$supp(\nu) \subset \cup_{l=1}^{p}[u_l; v_l] \tag{2.30}$$

and for each $l \in \{1,\ldots,p\}$, $[u_l;v_l] \cap supp(\nu) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover,

$$supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) = \cup_{l=1}^{p}[\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l^-); \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)], \tag{2.31}$$

with for all $l = 1,\ldots,p-1, \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_{l+1}^-)$, and for all $l = 1,\ldots,p$,

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l^-) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+). \tag{2.32}$$

Proof of Proposition 2.7:

- Assume $c = 1$. Denote by $\mu_{sc}(\sigma)$ the centered semi-circular distribution with variance σ^2 and by τ the symmetrization of the pushforward of ν by the map $t \mapsto \sqrt{t}$. We have seen in the proof of Proposition 2.2 that $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1}$ is the distribution of X^2 where X is a symmetrical absolutely continuous random variable with distribution $\mu_{sc}(\sigma) \boxplus \tau$. If the support of ν has a finite number of connected components, since supp$(\tau) \subset \overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ (see (2.17) and each connected component of $\overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ contains at least an element of supp(τ) (see Remark 2.2 in [9]), we can deduce that $\overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ has a finite number of connected components:

$$\overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}} = \bigcup_{l=m}^{1} \Big[s_l, t_l \Big].$$

Then, by (2.18) and since $H_{\sigma,\tau}$ is globally strictly increasing on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \overline{U_{\sigma,\tau}}$ (see Remark 2.1 in [9]), we have

$$\text{supp}(\mu_{sc}(\sigma) \boxplus \tau) = \bigcup_{l=m}^{1} \Big[H_{\sigma,\tau}(s_l^-), H_{\sigma,\tau}(t_l^+) \Big]. \tag{2.33}$$

Then, it readily follows from (2.33) that there exists an integer number p and $a_1 \leq b_1 < a_2 \leq b_2 < \ldots a_p \leq b_p$ such that

$$\text{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,1}) = \cup_{l=1}^{p} [a_i; b_i]. \tag{2.34}$$

- Assume $c < 1$. We need the following preliminary lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that the support of ν has a finite number of connected components and let I be a connected component of $\mathbb{R} \backslash supp(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$. Then $\overline{K(\{x \in I, K'(x) > 0\})}$ is connected.*

Proof: Assume first that I is bounded: $I =]a; b[$ for some a and b in $\mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 2.5. *If r and t in I satisfy $, r < t, K^{'}(r) > 0, K^{'}(t) < 0$, then for all $z > t$, $z \in I$, we have $K^{'}(z) \leq 0$.*

Proof: Set $t_2 = \min\{z > r, z \in I, K^{'}(z) < 0\}$. We have $K^{'}(t_2) = 0$. Since $K^{'}$ is holomorphic on $\{z \in \mathbb{C}, \Re(z) \in I\}$, its zeroes are isolated. Therefore, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that $K^{'} < 0$ on $]t_2, t_2 + \epsilon[$. Thus, $K(t_2 + \epsilon) < K(t_2)$. Moreover, we have $t_2 > r$ and $K^{'} \geq 0$ on $]r; t_2[$. Using once more the isolated zeroes principle, we can find $\epsilon^{'}$ small enough such that $K(t_2 + \epsilon) < K(t_2 - \epsilon^{'}) < K(t_2)$ and $K^{'}(t_2 - \epsilon^{'}) > 0$. Assume that there exists $z > t_2 + \epsilon$ in I such that $K^{'}(z) > 0$. Then, set $t_3 = \min\{z > t_2 + \epsilon, z \in I, K^{'}(z) > 0\}$. We have $K^{'}(t_3) = 0$ and $K^{'} \leq 0$ on $]t_2 + \epsilon, t_3[$. Thus $K(t_3) \leq K(t_2 + \epsilon) < K(t_2 - \epsilon^{'})$. Using similar arguments as above we can find $\epsilon^{''}$ small enough such that $K^{'}(t_3 + \epsilon^{''}) > 0$ and $K(t_3) < K(t_3 + \epsilon^{''}) < K(t_2 - \epsilon^{'})$ which leads to a contradiction with Lemma 2.3. Therefore there does not exist any $z > t_2 + \epsilon$ in I such that $K^{'}(z) > 0$. Moreover $K^{'} < 0$ on $]t_2, t_2 + \epsilon]$. Hence we have $K^{'}(z) \leq 0$ for any $z > t_2$ and Lemma 2.5 follows. □

Set $\mathcal{O} = \{z \in I, K^{'}(z) > 0\}$. Assume that $\mathcal{O}$ is nonempty. Define

$$z_1 = \min\{z \in I, K^{'}(z) > 0\},$$

$$z_2 = \begin{cases} \min\{z \in I, z > z_1, K^{'}(z) < 0\} \text{ if } \{z \in I, z > z_1, K^{'}(z) < 0\} \neq \emptyset, \\ b \text{ else.} \end{cases}$$

Assume that $z_1 = z_2$ which implies $z_2 \neq b$ and then $\{z \in I, z > z_1, K^{'}(z) < 0\} \neq \emptyset$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, there exists t_3 in $]z_1; z_1 + \epsilon[$ such that $K^{'}(t_3) > 0$. Now, there exists t_2 in $]z_1, t_3[$, such that $K^{'}(t_2) < 0$ and there exists t_1 in $]z_1, t_2[$ such that $K^{'}(t_1) > 0$, which leads to a contradiction with Lemma 2.5. Hence we must have $z_1 < z_2$ and Lemma 2.5 readily yields that $K^{'}(z) \leq 0$ for any z in I such that $z > z_2$ if $z_2 < b$.
Therefore $\mathcal{O} =]z_1, z_2[\setminus \{z \in]z_1, z_2[, K^{'}(z) = 0\}$.
Since $\lim_{x \to \pm\infty} K^{'}(x) = 1$, there exists $R > 0$ such that $R > \max\{u \in \text{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})\}$ and $K^{'} > 0$ on $] - \infty; -R]$ and $[R; +\infty[$. Since up to now, we assume that I is a bounded connected component of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$, according to Lemma 2.3, we have for any z in $\mathcal{O}$, $K(-R) < K(z) < K(R)$. Then, if $z_1 = a$ or $z_2 = b$, we can define $K(z_1) = \inf_{z \in \mathcal{O}} K(z) = \inf_{z \in]z_1, z_2[} K(z)$ and $K(z_2) = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{O}} K(z) = \sup_{z \in]z_1, z_2[} K(z)$. It comes easily that $\overline{K(\mathcal{O})} = [K(z_1); K(z_2)]$.
Now, if I is a connected component of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu_{\sigma\sqrt{c},\nu,1})$ of the form $] - \infty; a[$ or $]a; +\infty[$, the previous study can be carried out for $] - R; a[$ or $]a; R[$ and it readily follows that $\overline{K(\{x \in I, K'(x) > 0\})}$ is connected. □

According to Theorem 2.1 in [12] and Theorem 1.3 A), $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ is absolutely continuous and its density is continuous. Therefore, the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ is the closure of its interior. It readily follows from (2.34), Proposition 2.5, Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.3 and the fact that $\lim_{x \to -\infty} K(x) = -\infty$, $\lim_{x \to +\infty} K(x) = +\infty$, that there exists an integer number p and $a_1 \leq b_1 < a_2 \leq b_2 < \dots a_p \leq b_p$ (depending of course on σ, ν, c) such that $\text{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) = \cup_{l=1}^{p} [a_i; b_i]$.

Now, using (2.2), Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 and Corollary 2.1, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} =] - \infty; \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a_1^-)[\cup]\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b_1^+); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a_2^-)[\cup \cdots]\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b_p^+); +\infty[.$$

Therefore (2.29) is satisfied with $u_l = \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a_l^-)$ and $v_l = \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b_l^+)$. At this stage of the proof, we have $u_1 \leq v_1 < u_2 \leq v_2 < \cdots < u_p \leq v_p$. Now, Propositions 2.3 and 2.4, (2.29) and Proposition 2.6 yield

$$\text{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) = \cup_{l=1}^{p} [\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l^-); \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)],$$

that is (2.31), with moreover for all $l = 1, \dots, p-1, \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_{l+1}^-)$. Since $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ has no mass, we must have also for all $l = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l^-) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+). \tag{2.35}$$

Assume that there exists $l \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that $u_l = v_l$. We set $v_0 := -\infty$ and $u_{p+1} = +\infty$. We have $]v_{l-1}; v_l[\cup]v_l; u_{l+1}[\subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}(\nu)$. Since $1 + \sigma^2 c g_\nu > 0$ on $]v_{l-1}; v_l[$, v_l cannot be a mass of ν; therefore, we must have $v_l \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}(\nu)$

and then $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^-) = \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)$ which leads to a contradiction with (2.35). We can conclude that

$$\forall l \in \{1,\ldots,p\}, \quad u_l \neq v_l.$$

(2.30) is obvious since $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$.
Actually, we have the following

Lemma 2.6. *For each* $l \in \{1,\ldots,p\}$, $[u_l; v_l] \cap supp(\nu) \neq \emptyset$.

Assume that there exists $l \in \{1,\ldots,p\}$ such that $[u_l; v_l] \subset^c \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $\epsilon < \min\{(u_{k+1} - v_k); k = 1,\ldots,p-1\}$. Since $1 + \sigma^2 c g_\nu$ is strictly decreasing on $[u_l - \epsilon; v_l + \epsilon]$ and $]v_l; v_l + \epsilon[$ is a subset of $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$, we must have $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c} \leq 0$ on $[u_l; v_l]$ and then, since $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ is an holomorphic function on $\{z \in \mathbb{C}, \Re z \in]u_l; v_l[\}$, we have $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l)$ which leads to a contradiction with (2.35). □.
The proof of Proposition 2.7 is complete. □

Proposition 2.2 corresponds to A) of Theorem 1.3. B) 1) of Theorem 1.3 can be easily deduced from (2.2), Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4. B) 2) of Theorem 1.3 can be readily obtained by differentiating the relation $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)) = u, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. Proposition 2.6 and Corollaire 2.1 yield C) of Theorem 1.3. Proposition 2.7 corresponds to D) of Theorem 1.3. □

3 Exact separation phenomenon

3.1 Preliminary results

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 will need to establish the following preliminary proposition and lemmas.

Proposition 3.1. *: For all* $0 < \hat{\sigma} < \sigma$, $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}$ *so that it makes sense to consider the following composition of homeomorphisms*

$$\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c} \circ \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c} : \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \to \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}),$$

which is stricly increasing on each connected component of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$.

Proof: Let $0 < \hat{\sigma} < \sigma$. Let u be in $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. $g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$ obviously implies $g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}^2 c}$. We have

$$\Phi'_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(u) = (1 + c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)) \left\{ (1 + c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)) + \left[2uc\hat{\sigma}^2 + \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2(1-c)c\hat{\sigma}^2}{1 + c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)} \right] g'_\nu(u) \right\}.$$

- If $2uc\hat{\sigma}^2 + \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2(1-c)c\hat{\sigma}^2}{1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)} \leq 0$, it is obvious that $\Phi'_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(u) > 0$.
- If $2uc + \frac{(1-c)c}{\frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}^2} + c g_\nu(u)} > 0$, then $2uc + \frac{(1-c)c}{\frac{1}{\sigma^2} + c g_\nu(u)} > 0$. Moreover $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) > 0$ means that

$$(1 + c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u))^2 + 2u(1 + c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u))c\sigma^2 g'_\nu(u) + \sigma^2(1-c)c\sigma^2 g'_\nu(u) > 0.$$

Since $(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u))>0$ and $2uc+\frac{(1-c)c}{\frac{1}{\sigma^2}+cg_\nu(u)}>0$, this implies

$$g_\nu^{'}(u) > -\frac{(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u))}{2uc\sigma^2+\frac{\sigma^2(1-c)c\sigma^2}{1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u)}}. \tag{3.1}$$

(3.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)) + \left[2uc\hat{\sigma}^2 + \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2(1-c)c\hat{\sigma}^2}{1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)}\right] g_\nu^{'}(u) \\
> \; & (1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)) - \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u))}{2uc+\frac{(1-c)c\sigma^2}{1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u)}}\left(2uc+\frac{(1-c)c\hat{\sigma}^2}{1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)}\right) \\
> \; & (1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)) \\
& -\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u))}{2uc+\frac{(1-c)c\sigma^2}{1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u)}}\left(2uc+\frac{(1-c)c\sigma^2}{1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u)}+(1-c)c\left[\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)}-\frac{\sigma^2}{1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u)}\right]\right) \\
= \; & 1-\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{\sigma^2}+\Delta(u)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(u) &= -(1-c)c\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u))}{2uc+\frac{(1-c)c\sigma^2}{1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u)}}\left[\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u)}-\frac{\sigma^2}{1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u)}\right] \\
&= (1-c)c\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{\sigma^2}(\sigma^2-\hat{\sigma}^2)\frac{(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u))}{(1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(u))}\frac{1}{2uc(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(u))+(1-c)c\sigma^2} \\
&> 0
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\Phi^{'}_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(u)>0$.

$\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}\circ\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ is strictly increasing on each connected component of $\mathbb{R}\backslash\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,\mathrm{c}})$ by B) 2. of Theorem 1.3 and the very definition of $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}$ and the proof is complete. □

Lemma 3.1. *Let x be such that there exists $\delta>0$ such that for all large N, $[x-\delta;x+\delta]\subset^c \mu_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}$. Then for all $0<\tau<\delta$,*

$$\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}\left([x-\tau;x+\tau]\right)=[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x-\tau);\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x+\tau)]\subset^c \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\mathrm{A_NA_N^*}}).$$

Moreover, $g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}\left(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x)\right)$ converges towards $g_\nu\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right)$.

Proof: We will use several times the obvious fact that if a sequence μ_n of probability measures weakly converges towards a probability measure μ, if for some $\delta>0$, $[u-\delta;u+\delta]\subset^c$ supp μ_{n} for all large n, then $g_{\mu_n}(u)$ converges towards $g_\mu(u)$.
Let $0<\tau<\tau^{'}<\delta$. Since $\mu_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}$ weakly converges towards $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$, for any $u\in[x-\tau^{'};x+\tau^{'}]$, $\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(u)$ converges towards $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u)$ and $[x-\tau^{'};x+$

$\tau^{'}] \subset^c \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,\mathrm{c}})$. According to B) 2) of Theorem 1.3 , $\omega^{'}_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N} > 0$ and $\omega^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c} > 0$ on $[x-\tau^{'};x+\tau^{'}]$. It readily follows that, for all large N,

$$[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x-\tau);\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x+\tau)] \subset]\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x-\tau^{'});\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x+\tau^{'})[\subset^c \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\mathrm{A_NA_N^*}})$$

where we used B) 1. of Theorem 1.3 for the last inclusion. Therefore there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for all large N,

$$[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)-\alpha;\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)+\alpha] \subset^c \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\mathrm{A_NA_N^*}}). \tag{3.2}$$

It follows that $g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))$ converges towards $g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))$.
Now, let ϵ be such that $0 < \epsilon < \alpha/2$ and $N_0(\epsilon)$ be such that for all $N \geq N_0(\epsilon)$, $|\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x) - \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)| < \epsilon$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x)) - g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))| \\
&\leq \quad |\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x) - \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)| \int \frac{d\mu_{A_NA_N^*}(t)}{|\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x)-t|\;|\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)-t|} \\
&\leq \quad \frac{2\epsilon}{\alpha^2}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (3.2) in the last inequality. It follows that $g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x)) - g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))$ converges towards 0 when N goes to infinity.
Writing

$$\begin{aligned}
&g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x)) - g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) \\
&\qquad = \quad g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x) - g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) \\
&\qquad\qquad + g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) - g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)),
\end{aligned}$$

we can finally deduce that $g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c_N}(x))$ converges towards $g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))$.
$\square$

Lemma 3.2. *Let* $[a,b]$ *(*$a \neq b$*) be a compact set satisfying the couple* $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ *of properties defined in Theorem 1.1 7. and such that, if* $c < 1$, $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) > 0$. *For all* $0 < \hat{\sigma} < \sigma$, *define* $a(\hat{\sigma}) = \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))$ *and* $b(\hat{\sigma}) = \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))$. *Then* $[a(\hat{\sigma}), b(\hat{\sigma})]$ *satisfies the couple* $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\sigma})$ *of properties. Moreover, there exists* $m_{a,b} > 0$ *such that for all* $0 < \hat{\sigma} < \sigma$,

$$b(\hat{\sigma}) - a(\hat{\sigma}) \geq m_{a,b}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2: Denote by δ and τ the parameters introduced in 7. of Theorem 1.1. Note that if $c = 1$, since $a > 0$ and using (2.5), we have

$$\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) > 0 \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover, according to B) 1. of Theorem 1.3 and Proposition 3.1, for any $0 < c \leq 1$ and any $0 < \hat{\sigma} < \sigma$, we have $1 + c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a)) > 0$. Therefore it readily follows that if $c = 1$, then $a(\hat{\sigma}) > 0$ and if $c < 1$, if $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) > 0$, then $a(\hat{\sigma}) > 0$.

Moreover, since according to Proposition 3.1, $x \mapsto \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c} \circ \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)$ is strictly increasing on $[a; b]$, we have $0 < a(\hat{\sigma}) < b(\hat{\sigma})$.
According to Lemma 3.1, for all $0 < \tau^{'} < \delta$ and for all $x \in [a - \tau^{'}; b + \tau^{'}]$, $g_{\mu_{A_N A_N^*}} \left(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(x)\right)$ converges towards $g_\nu \left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right)$. It readily follows that for any $\hat{\sigma} > 0$, $\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N} \left(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(x)\right)$ converges towards $\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)\right)$. According to Proposition 3.1, $x \mapsto \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))$ and $x \mapsto \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(x))$ are strictly increasing on $[a - \tau^{'}; b + \tau^{'}]$. It readily follows that, for all $0 < \tau^{''} < \tau^{'} < \delta$, for all large N,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c} \circ \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a - \tau^{''}); \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c} \circ \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b + \tau^{''})] \\
\subset \quad &]\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(a - \tau^{'})); \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(b + \tau^{'}))[\\
\subset \quad & {}^c\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{\mathrm{A_N A_N^*}},\mathrm{c_N}}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a)) - \alpha > 0$ and

$$
[\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a)) - \alpha; \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b)) + \alpha] \subset^c \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{\mathrm{A_N A_N^*}},\mathrm{c_N}})
$$

which is the first property of $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\sigma})$.

The second property of $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\sigma})$ will be obviously satisfied if we prove that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all large N,

$$
\omega_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(]a(\hat{\sigma}) - \epsilon; b(\hat{\sigma}) + \epsilon[) \subset \omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(]a - \tau; b + \tau[). \tag{3.5}
$$

We have proved that there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a)) - \alpha; \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b)) + \alpha] \\
\subset \quad &]\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(a - \tau)); \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(b + \tau))[\\
\subset \quad & {}^c\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{\mathrm{A_N A_N^*}},\mathrm{c_N}}).
\end{aligned}
$$

(3.5) follows from the fact that, according to B) of Theorem 1.3, $\omega_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}$ is strictly increasing on the intervals involved in the inclusion and moreover $\omega_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N} \circ \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(x) = x$ for each x in $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\sigma},\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}$.
Let us prove (3.3). Let x be in $\mathbb{R}\backslash\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$. Note that $1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) > 0$ since according to B) 1. of Theorem 1.3 , $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. We have

$$
\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) = \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)(1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)))^2+\hat{\sigma}^2(1-c)(1+c\hat{\sigma}^2 g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)))
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \quad & \frac{\hat\sigma^4}{\sigma^4}\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) + \hat\sigma^2(1-c)(1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}) \\
& + \left[(1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})^2 + 2\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}(1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)))\right]\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) \\
= \quad & \frac{\hat\sigma^4}{\sigma^4}x + (1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})^2\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) + \frac{2}{(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)))}\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}(1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)) \\
& -\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}(1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})\sigma^2(1-c) \\
= \quad & \frac{\hat\sigma^4}{\sigma^4}x + (1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})^2\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) + \frac{2x}{(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)))}\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}(1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}) \\
& -\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}(1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})\sigma^2(1-c)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore

$$\Phi_{\hat\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b)) - \Phi_{\hat\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))$$

$$= \frac{\hat\sigma^4}{\sigma^4}(b-a) + (1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})^2\left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b) - \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a)\right) + 2\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}(1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})\left(f(b)-f(a)\right),$$

where $f(x) = \frac{x}{(1+c\sigma^2 g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)))}$. Using B) 2. of Theorem 1.3, $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ and f are obviously strictly increasing on $[a,b]$ (using also $a>0$). Define

$$m_{a,b} = \min\left\{(b-a); \left(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b) - \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a)\right); \left(f(b)-f(a)\right)\right\}.$$

We have

$$\Phi_{\hat\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b)) - \Phi_{\hat\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a)) \geq \left[\frac{\hat\sigma^4}{\sigma^4} + (1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})^2 + 2\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2}(1-\frac{\hat\sigma^2}{\sigma^2})\right] m_{a,b} = m_{a,b}.\Box$$

The proof of Theorem 1.2 will also rely on the following classical results.

Theorem 3.1. *(cf. Theorem 7.3.7 in [13]) For any $n \times N$ matrix X, the eigenvalues of the $(n+N)\times(n+N)$ matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & X \\ X^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ are*

$$-\sqrt{\lambda_1(XX^*)} \leq \cdots \leq -\sqrt{\lambda_n(XX^*)} \leq 0 = \cdots = 0 \leq \sqrt{\lambda_n(XX^*)} \leq \cdots \leq \sqrt{\lambda_1(XX^*)}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *(cf. Theorem 4.3.7 of [13]) Let B and C be two $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices. For any pair of integers j,k such that $1 \leq j,k \leq N$ and $j+k \leq N+1$, we have*

$$\lambda_{j+k-1}(B+C) \leq \lambda_j(B) + \lambda_k(C).$$

For any pair of integers j,k such that $1 \leq j,k \leq N$ and $j+k \geq N+1$, we have

$$\lambda_j(B) + \lambda_k(C) \leq \lambda_{j+k-N}(B+C).$$

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

This proof is in the lineage of [1], [8],[9].

Proof of Theorem 1.2: For any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp} \nu$, $\hat{\sigma} \mapsto \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(x)$ is continuous and then bounded on $[0;\sigma]$. Therefore there exists $M_{a,b} > 0$ such that for all $\hat{\sigma} \in]0;\sigma]$,

$$0 < |\sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))} + \sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))}| \leq M_{a,b}.$$

Then using (3.3) in Lemma 3.2, we can easily deduce that there exists $\tilde{m}_{a,b} > 0$ such that for all for all $\hat{\sigma} \in]0;\sigma]$,

$$\sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))} - \sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))} \geq \tilde{m}_{a,b}. \tag{3.6}$$

Note that for $\hat{\sigma} = 0$, $\Phi_{0,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a)) = \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) > 0$ (by assumption if $c < 1$ and according to (3.4) if $c = 1$) and $\Phi_{0,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b)) = \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b) > \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a)$. Therefore we can choose $\tilde{m}_{a,b} > 0$ such that (3.6) is true for any $\hat{\sigma} \in [0;\sigma]$. Since $\hat{\sigma} \mapsto \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))$ and $\hat{\sigma} \mapsto \Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))$ are uniformly continuous on $[0;\sigma]$, there exists

$$0 < \delta_{a,b} < \frac{\tilde{m}_{a,b}}{4} \tag{3.7}$$

such that for any $\hat{\sigma}$, $\hat{\sigma}'$ in $[0;\sigma]$ satisfying $|\hat{\sigma} - \hat{\sigma}'| \leq \delta_{a,b}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))} - \sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma}',\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))}| < \tfrac{\tilde{m}_{a,b}}{4}, \\ \text{and } \; &|\sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))} - \sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma}',\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))}| < \tfrac{\tilde{m}_{a,b}}{4}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

According to [10], we can choose $C > 1$ large enough such that almost surely, for all large N,

$$0 \leq \sqrt{\lambda_1(X_N X_N^*)} < C. \tag{3.9}$$

Then, let us choose

$$0 < C_{a,b} < \frac{\delta_{a,b}}{C\sigma}. \tag{3.10}$$

Given $k \geq 0$ define

$$\sigma_k = \sigma(1 - \frac{1}{1 + kC_{a,b}}),$$

$$s_k = \sqrt{\Phi_{\sigma_k,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))}$$

and

$$t_k = \sqrt{\Phi_{\sigma_k,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))}.$$

Note that for all k,

$$|\sigma_{k+1} - \sigma_k| \leq C_{a,b}\sigma. \tag{3.11}$$

According to (3.6), for any k,

$$t_k - s_k \geq \tilde{m}_{a,b} \tag{3.12}$$

and according to (3.8), (3.10) and (3.11),

$$|s_{k+1} - s_k| < \frac{\tilde{m}_{a,b}}{4} \text{ and } |t_{k+1} - t_k| < \frac{\tilde{m}_{a,b}}{4}. \tag{3.13}$$

Now, let us introduce a continuum of matrices $M_N^{(k)}$ interpolating from M_N to $A_N A_N^*$:

$$M_N^{(k)} := (\sigma_k X_N + A_N)(\sigma_k X_N + A_N)^*.$$

For all $k \geq 0$, set

$$\mathrm{E}_k = \{\text{no eigenvalues of } M_N^{(k)} \text{ in } [s_k^2, t_k^2], \text{ for all large } N\}.$$

By Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 1.1, we know that $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{E}_k) = 1$ for all $k > 0$. Moreover, according to Lemma 3.1, for $N \geq N_0$, $[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b)] \subset^c \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{\mathrm{A_N A_N^*}})$. For $N \geq N_0$, let i_N be such that

$$\lambda_{i_N+1}(A_N) < \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) \text{ and } \lambda_{i_N}(M_N^{(k)}) > \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b). \tag{3.14}$$

We shall show that by induction on k that one has for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\lambda_{i_N+1}(M_N^{(k)}) < s_k^2 \text{ and } \lambda_{i_N}(M_N^{(k)}) > t_k^2, \text{ for all large } N] = 1. \tag{3.15}$$

This is true for $k = 0$ since $\sigma_0 = 0$, $M_N^{(0)} = A_N A_N^*$ and $\Phi_{0,\nu,c}(x) = x$. Now, let us assume that (3.15) holds true. Defined

$$Y_N^{(k)} = \sigma_k \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X_N \\ X_N^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_N \\ A_N^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using Theorem 3.1, (3.15) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}[\lambda_{i_N+1}(Y_N^{(k)}) < s_k \text{ and } \lambda_{i_N}(Y_N^{(k)}) > t_k, \text{ for all large } N] = 1. \tag{3.16}$$

Since

$$Y_N^{(k+1)} = Y_N^{(k)} + \frac{\sigma C_{a,b}}{(1 + (k+1)C_{a,b})(1 + kC_{a,b})} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X_N \\ X_N^* & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

we can deduce from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\lambda_{i_N+1}(Y_N^{(k+1)}) \leq \lambda_{i_N+1}(Y_N^{(k)}) + \sqrt{\lambda_1(X_N X_N^*)} C_{a,b} \sigma.$$

It follows using (3.9), (3.7) and (3.10) that

$$\lambda_{i_N+1}(Y_N^{(k+1)}) < s_k + \frac{\tilde{m}_{a,b}}{4} := \hat{s}_k \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Similarly, one can show that

$$\lambda_{i_N}(Y_N^{(k+1)}) > t_k - \frac{\tilde{m}_{a,b}}{4} := \hat{t}_k \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Inequalities (3.13) and (3.12) ensure that

$$[\hat{s}_k, \hat{t}_k] \subset [s_{k+1}, t_{k+1}].$$

As $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{E}_{k+1}) = 1$, we deduce that, with probability 1,

$$\lambda_{i_N+1}(Y_N^{(k+1)}) < s_{k+1} \text{ and } \lambda_{i_N}(Y_N^{(k+1)}) > t_{k+1}, \quad \text{for all large } N$$

and therefore

$$\lambda_{i_N+1}(M_N^{(k+1)}) < s_{k+1}^2 \text{ and } \lambda_{i_N}(M_N^{(k+1)}) > t_{k+1}^2, \quad \text{for all large } N.$$

This completes the proof by induction of (3.15).

Now, we are going to show that there exists K large enough so that, for all $k \geq K$, there is an exact separation of the eigenvalues of the matrices M_N and $M_N^{(k)}$.
Let α be such that $0 < \alpha < \frac{\sqrt{b}-\sqrt{a}}{2}$. There exists $0 < \delta < \frac{\alpha}{2}$ such that for any $\hat{\sigma}$ in $[0;\sigma]$ satisfying $|\hat{\sigma} - \sigma| \leq \delta$, we have

$$|\sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))} - \sqrt{\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))}| \leq \frac{\alpha}{2},$$
$$\text{and } |\sqrt{\Phi_{\hat{\sigma},\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))} - \sqrt{\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))}| \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

Let K be a positive integer number such that

$$\frac{C\sigma}{1 + KC_{a,b}} < \delta.$$

Using Lemma 3.3, (3.15) and (3.9), we get the following inequalities almost surely for all large N.
If $i_N < N$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{i_N+1}(Y_N) &\leq \lambda_{i_N+1}(Y_N^{(K)}) + (\sigma - \sigma_K)\sqrt{\lambda_1(X_N X_N^*)} \\
&< s_K + \frac{C\sigma}{1 + KC_{a,b}} \\
&= \sqrt{\Phi_{\sigma_K,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a))} + \frac{C\sigma}{1 + KC_{a,b}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{a} + \alpha
\end{aligned}$$

If $i_N > 0$, for all large N,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{i_N}(Y_N) &\geq \lambda_{i_N}(Y_N^{(K)}) - (\sigma - \sigma_K)\sqrt{\lambda_1(X_N X_N^*)} \\
&> t_K - \frac{C\sigma}{1 + KC_{a,b}} \\
&= \sqrt{\Phi_{\sigma_K,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(b))} - \frac{C\sigma}{1 + KC_{a,b}} \\
&\geq \sqrt{b} - \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $[\sqrt{a}+\alpha;\sqrt{b}-\alpha] \subset [\sqrt{a};\sqrt{b}]$ and almost surely, for all N large enough $[\sqrt{a};\sqrt{b}]$ is a gap in the spectrum of Y_N, we can deduce that, almost surely, for all N large enough

$$\lambda_{i_N+1}(Y_N) < \sqrt{a} \quad \text{if} \;\; i_N < N, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\text{and} \quad \lambda_{i_N}(Y_N) > \sqrt{b} \quad \text{if} \;\; i_N > 0. \tag{3.18}$$

It follows that, almost surely, for all N large enough

$$\lambda_{i_N+1}(M_N) < a \quad \text{if} \;\; i_N < N, \tag{3.19}$$

$$\text{and} \quad \lambda_{i_N}(M_N) > b \quad \text{if} \;\; i_N > 0. \tag{3.20}$$

Since $\lambda_{N+1}(M_N) = -\lambda_0(M_N) = -\infty$, (3.19) (resp. (3.20)) is obviously satisfied if $i_N = N$ (resp. $i_N = 0$). This ends the proof of Theorem 1.2. $\square$

Remark 3.1. *Assume that $c < 1$. It readily follows from Theorem 1.3 that $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus supp(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$, $a > \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_1^+)$ implies $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) > v_1 \geq 0$. Nevertheless, the fact that $a > 0$ is not included in $[0;\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-)[$ is not a necessary condition for $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(a) > 0$ to hold as the following example shows. Let us choose $\nu = \delta_2$, $c = \frac{1}{2}$, $\sigma^2 = 1$. We have $g_\nu(u) > -\frac{1}{c\sigma^2} \iff u < \frac{3}{2}$ and for any $x \leq 0.6$, $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u) > 0$. Therefore $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0,5) > 0$ is on the left hand side of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ whereas $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(0,5)) = 0,5 > 0$. Remark 1.2 follows.*

4 Application to spiked models

4.1 Matricial model and notations

We will consider the deformed model:

$$M_N = (\sigma X_N + A_N)(\sigma X_N + A_N)^* \tag{4.1}$$

- $n \leq N$, $c_N = n/N \to c \in]0;1]$.
- X_N satisfies conditions 1., 2. and 3. of Theorem 1.1.
- Let $\nu \neq \delta_0$ be a compactly supported probability measure whose support has a finite number of connected components. Let $\theta_1 > \ldots > \theta_J > 0$ be J fixed real numbers independent of N which are outside the support of ν. Let $k_1, \ldots, k_J$ be fixed nonnull integer numbers independent of N and $r = \sum_{j=1}^J k_j$. Let $\beta_j(N) \geq 0$, $r+1 \leq j \leq n$, be such that $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=r+1}^n \delta_{\beta_j(N)}$ weakly converges to ν and

  $$\max_{r+1 \leq j \leq n} \operatorname{dist}(\beta_j(N), \operatorname{supp}(\nu)) \underset{N\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0. \tag{4.2}$$

  Let $a_j(N), j = 1, \ldots, J$, and $b_j(N) \geq 0$, $r+1 \leq j \leq n$, be complex numbers such that

  $$\lim_{N\to+\infty} |a_j(N)|^2 = \theta_j,$$

$$|b_j(N)|^2 = \beta_j(N).$$

Let us introduce the $n \times N$ deterministic matrix A_N by setting for any $j = 1, \ldots, J$,

$$(A_N)_{ii} = a_j(N) \quad \text{for } i = k_1 + \ldots + k_{j-1} + l,\ l = 1, \ldots, k_j,$$

for any $r + 1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$(A_N)_{ii} = b_i(N).$$

and else $(A_N)_{ij} = 0$.

Thus, $A_N A_N^*$ is a diagonal matrix, each $|a_j(N)|^2$ is an eigenvalue of $A_N A_N^*$ with a fixed multiplicity k_j (with $\sum_{j=1}^J k_j = r$) and the other eigenvalues of $A_N A_N^*$ are the $\beta_j(N)$. Moreover the empirical spectral measure of $A_N A_N^*$ weakly converges to ν. We will denote by Θ the set

$$\Theta := \{\theta_1; \cdots ; \theta_J\}$$

and by $K_{\nu,\Theta}$ the set

$$K_{\nu,\Theta} := \text{supp}(\nu) \cup \Theta. \tag{4.3}$$

4.2 Subordination property of rectangular free convolution of ratio c

For any $c \in]0, 1]$, the rectangular free convolution $\boxplus_c$ is defined in [3] in the following way. Let $M_{n,N}$, $N_{n,N}$ be n by N independent random matrices, one of them having a distribution which is invariant by multiplication by any unitary matrix on any side, the symmetrized empirical singular measures of which tend, as N tends to infinity in such a way that n/N tends to c, to nonrandom probability measures ν_1, ν_2. Then the symmetrized empirical singular law [2] of $M_{n,N} + N_{n,N}$ tends to $\nu_1 \boxplus_c \nu_2$.

For any probability measure τ on $[0; +\infty[$, let us denote by $\sqrt{\tau}^s$ the symmetrization of the pushfoward of τ by the map $t \mapsto \sqrt{t}$ and by $\sigma^2\tau$ the pushforward of τ by the map $t \mapsto \sigma^2\tau$. Note that the limiting spectral measure μ of M_N defined in (4.1) does not depend on the distribution of the entries of X_N. Thus, choosing gaussian entries for X_N, we can deduce that the limiting spectral measure $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ of M_N satisfies

$$\sqrt{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}^s = \sqrt{\nu}^s \boxplus_c \sqrt{\sigma^2\mu_c}^s,$$

where μ_c is the well-known Marchenko-Pastur law defined by

$$\mu_c(dx) = \max\{1 - \frac{1}{c}, 0\}\delta_0 + f(x)\mathbf{1}_{[(1-\sqrt{c})^2;(1+\sqrt{c})^2]}(x)dx \tag{4.4}$$

---

[2] The empirical singular measure of a n by N ($n \leq N$) matrix M is the uniform law on the eigenvalues of $\sqrt{MM^*}$.

with

$$f(x)=\frac{\sqrt{(x-(1-\sqrt{c})^2)\,((1+\sqrt{c})^2-x)}}{2\pi cx}.$$

Let us now explain the intuition of our result. Using (2.7), one can easily see that for any $x\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})\cup\{0\}\}$,

$$c\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))^2+(1-c)g_\nu(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))=cxg_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x)^2+(1-c)g_{\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}}(x).$$

Note that this has to be related with the subordination result established in [4] involving the H transform related to rectangular free convolution with ratio c. Indeed, for any probability measure τ on $[0;+\infty[$, the H transform of $\sqrt{\tau}^s$ is such that $H_{\sqrt{\tau}^s}(z)=\frac{c}{z}g_\tau(\frac{1}{z})^2+(1-c)g_\tau(\frac{1}{z})$ and the authors established in [4] that for any probability measures μ and τ on $[0;+\infty[$, there exists a meromorphic function F on $\mathbb{C}\setminus[0;+\infty[$ such that $H_{\sqrt{\nu}^s\boxplus_c\sqrt{\tau}^s}(z)=H_{\sqrt{\nu}^s}(F(z))$.
The intuition is that for large N,

$$\begin{aligned}
&cxg_{\mu_{M_N}}(x)^2+(1-c)g_{\mu_{M_N}}(x)\\
&\qquad\approx\quad cxg_{\mu_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c}}(x)^2+(1-c)g_{\mu_{\sigma,\mu_{A_NA_N^*},c}}(x)\\
&\qquad\approx\quad c\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))^2+(1-c)g_{\mu_{A_NA_N^*}}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x))
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore that they will be eigenvalues of M_N that separate from the bulk whenever some of the equations

$$\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)=\theta_j,$$

$j=1,\ldots,J$, admits a solution outside the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$. According to Proposition 2.1, $\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x)=\theta_j$ admits a solution outside the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ if and only if $\Phi'_{\nu,\sigma,c}(\theta_j)>0, g_\nu(\theta_j)>-\frac{1}{\sigma^2c}$. Moreover there is only one such a solution which is $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\theta_j)$.

This intuition lead us to introduce the following set

$$\Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}=\left\{\theta\in\Theta,\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\theta)>0,g_\nu(\theta)>-\frac{1}{\sigma^2c}\right\},$$

and to introduce for any θ in $\Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}$,

$$\rho_\theta=\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\theta).$$

According to B) 1) of Theorem 1.3, $\forall\theta\in\Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}$, $\rho_\theta\notin\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$.

4.3 Inclusion of the spectrum

Let us define

$$\mathcal{S}=\text{ supp }(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})\cup\{\rho_\theta,\theta\in\Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}\}. \tag{4.5}$$

We have the following inclusion of the spectrum of M_N.

Theorem 4.1. *A) For any* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\textit{for all large } N, \mathrm{spect}(\mathrm{M_N}) \subset \{\mathrm{x} \in \mathbb{R}, \textit{dist}(\mathrm{x}, \mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}) \leq \epsilon\}] = 1.$$

B) Moreover, if $u_1 > 0$ *(u_1 is defined in Theorem 1.3 D)), for any* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\textit{for all large } N, \mathrm{spect}(\mathrm{M_N}) \subset \{\mathrm{x} \in \mathbb{R}, \textit{dist}(\mathrm{x}, \mathcal{S}) \leq \epsilon\}] = 1.$$

In order to prove Theorem 4.1, we first establish the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *Let* $[u, v] \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{S}$. *For any* $\delta > 0$ *small enough, for all large* N, $[u - \delta; v + \delta] \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \textit{supp}(\mu_{\sigma, \mu_{A_N A_N^*}, c_N})$.

Proof: There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $[u - \delta_0; v + \delta_0] \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{S}$. According to B) of Theorem 1.3, we have $]\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \delta_0); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \delta_0)[\subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ and for any x in $]\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \delta_0); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \delta_0)[$, $\Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) > 0$, $g_\nu(x) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}$. In particular $\{\Theta \setminus \Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}\} \bigcap]\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \delta_0); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \delta_0)[= \emptyset$. Moreover it is clear by B) of Theorem 1.3 that since for any θ in $\Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}$, $\rho_\theta \notin]u - \delta_0; v + \delta_0[$, $\Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c} \bigcap]\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \delta_0); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \delta_0)[= \emptyset$. Therefore,

$$]\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \delta_0); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \delta_0)[\subset \mathbb{R} \setminus K_{\nu,\Theta},$$

where $K_{\nu,\Theta}$ is defined in (4.3). Note that using B) 2) of Theorem 1.3, we have $[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \frac{\delta_0}{2}); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \frac{\delta_0}{2})] \subset]\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \delta_0); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \delta_0)[$. Then there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$d\left([\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \frac{\delta_0}{2}); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \frac{\delta_0}{2})], K_{\nu,\Theta}\right) > \alpha.$$

Moreover according to the assumptions on the eigenvalues of $A_N A_N^*$, there exists some $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $N \geq N_0$, $\max_{r+1 \leq i \leq n} d(\beta_i(N), \mathrm{supp}(\nu)) < \alpha/2$ and $\max_{i=1,\ldots,r} d(|a_i(N)|, \theta_i) < \alpha/2$ so that the spectrum of $A_N A_N^*$ is included in $\left\{x, d\left(x, K_{\nu,\Theta}\right) < \frac{\alpha}{2}\right\}$. Therefore for $N \geq N_0$,

$$d\left([\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \frac{\delta_0}{2}); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \frac{\delta_0}{2})], \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{A_N A_N^*})\right) > \frac{\alpha}{2} > 0.$$

Moreover there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\text{for any } x \text{ in } [\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u - \tfrac{\delta_0}{2}); \omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v + \tfrac{\delta_0}{2})],\ g_\nu(x) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c} + \epsilon \text{ and } \Phi'_{\sigma,\nu,c}(x) > \epsilon. \tag{4.6}$$

Let us decompose $\mu_{A_N A_N^*}$ as

$$\mu_{A_N A_N^*} = \hat{\mu}_{\beta,N} + \hat{\mu}_{\Theta,N},$$

$$\text{where } \hat{\mu}_{\beta,N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=r+1}^{n} \delta_{\beta_j(N)} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_{\Theta,N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{J} k_j \delta_{|a_j(N)|^2}.$$

We begin with a trivial technical lemma we will need in the following.

Lemma 4.1. *$g_{\mu_{A_N A_N^*}}$, $g^{'}_{\mu_{A_N A_N^*}}$ and $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}$ converge to g_ν, g'_ν and $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ respectively uniformly on $[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2});\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2})]$.*

Proof of Lemma 4.1: First one can notice that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, for N large enough, for any x in $[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2});\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2})]$,

$$-g'_{\hat{\mu}_{\Theta,N}}(x) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{J}\frac{k_j}{(x-|a_j(N)|^2)^2} \leq \epsilon. \tag{4.7}$$

We prove now that for all $x \in [\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2});\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2})]$,

$$-g'_{\hat{\mu}_{\beta,N}}(x) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=r+1}^{n}\frac{1}{(x-\beta_j)^2} \underset{N\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} \int \frac{d\nu(t)}{(x-t)^2} = -g'_\nu(x). \tag{4.8}$$

For all $x \in [\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2});\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2})]$, let h_x be a bounded continuous function defined on $\mathbb{R}$ which coincides with $f_x(t) = 1/(x-t)^2$ on $\mathrm{supp}(\nu)+[-\frac{\alpha}{2},\frac{\alpha}{2}]$. Since the sequence of measures $\hat{\mu}_{\beta,N}$ weakly converges to ν, (4.8) follows, observing that $-g'_{\hat{\mu}_{\beta,N}}(x) = \int h_x(t)\,d\hat{\mu}_{\beta,N}(t)$ and $-g'_\nu(x) = \int h_x(t)d\nu(t)$.
The uniform convergence follows from Montel's theorem, since $g'_{\hat{\mu}_{\beta,N}}$ and g'_ν are analytic on $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \mathrm{dist}(z,\mathrm{supp}(\nu)) > \frac{\alpha}{2}\}$ and uniformly bounded on D by $\frac{4}{\alpha^2}$ for all large N.
The same study can be carried out for $g_{\mu_{A_N A_N^*}}$ and the uniform convergence of $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}$ towards $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ on $[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2});\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2})]$ readily follows. □

Hence using (4.6) and Lemma 4.1, we can claim that for all large N, for all x in $[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2});\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2})]$, $g_{\mu_{A_N A_N^*}}(x) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c}+\frac{\epsilon}{2} > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c_N}+\frac{\epsilon}{4}$ and $\Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(x) > \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Therefore for all large N,

$$\begin{aligned}&[\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\tfrac{\delta_0}{2});\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\tfrac{\delta_0}{2})]\\ &\subset \left\{u \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{A_N A_N^*}), \Phi^{'}_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(u) > 0, g_{\mu_{A_N A_N^*}}(u) > -\frac{1}{\sigma^2 c_N}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

According to B) 1) of Theorem 1.3, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}\left([\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\tfrac{\delta_0}{2});\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\tfrac{\delta_0}{2})]\right)\\ &= \left[[\Phi_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2}));\Phi_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2}))\right] \subset \mathbb{R}\setminus\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}).\end{aligned}$$

Now since $\Phi_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2}))$ and $\Phi_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2}))$ converge respectively towards $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2}))$ and $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2}))$ and using B 1) of Theorem 1.3, we have for all large N,

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\frac{\delta_0}{2})) \leq u-\frac{\delta_0}{4},$$

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N}(\omega_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v+\frac{\delta_0}{2})) \geq v + \frac{\delta_0}{4}$$

and then

$$[u - \frac{\delta_0}{4}; v + \frac{\delta_0}{4}] \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\mu_{A_N A_N^*},c_N})$$

and the proof of Proposition 4.1 is complete.□

Proof of Theorem 4.1: Using (3.9), assumption 4. of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 11.8 of [2], one can easily see that there exists $R > 0$ such that almost surely for all large N, $\|M_N\| < R$. Let us fix $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$2\epsilon < \min\Big\{\min_{l=1,\ldots,p-1}[\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_{l+1}^-) - \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)], d(\rho_{\theta_i}, \mathrm{supp}\ (\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})),$$
$$d(\rho_{\theta_i}, \rho_{\theta_j}), \theta_i \neq \theta_j \text{ in } \Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}\Big\} \tag{4.9}$$

If $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-) > 0$, choose ϵ such that (4.9) holds and moreover $2\epsilon < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-)$. Theorem 4.1 A) follows using Theorem 1.1 for each $[\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)+\epsilon; \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_{l+1}^-)-\epsilon]$, $l = 1, \ldots, p-1$, $[\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_p^+) + \epsilon; R]$, $[\rho_{\theta_i} - \epsilon; \rho_{\theta_i} + \epsilon]$, θ_i in $\Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}$, and, if $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-) > 0$, $[\epsilon; \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-) - \epsilon]$, since Proposition 4.1 implies 7. (i) of Theorem 1.1 and 7. (ii) of Theorem 1.1 is obviously satisfied since A_N is diagonal. Now, if $u_1 > 0$, we have $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-) > 0$. Let $u = \min\{u_1, \theta_i \in \Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}\} > 0$. Applying Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 1.2 to $[\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\frac{u}{2}); \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\frac{3u}{2})]$, we obtain that almost surely for all large N, there is no eigenvalue of M_N on the left hand side of $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\frac{u}{2})$ since $\mathrm{supp}(\nu) \subset \cup_{l=1}^p [u_l; v_l]$ and using the assumptions on the spectrum of $A_N A_N^*$. Using also A), we deduce B).□

4.4 Convergence of eigenvalues

In the non-spiked case i.e. $r = 0$, the result of Theorem 4.1 reads as: $\forall \epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathrm{Spect}(M_N) \subset \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) \cup \{0\} + (-\epsilon, \epsilon), \text{ for all } N \text{ large}] = 1, \tag{4.10}$$

and if $u_1 > 0$, then

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathrm{Spect}(M_N) \subset \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) + (-\epsilon, \epsilon), \text{ for all } N \text{ large}] = 1. \tag{4.11}$$

This readily leads to the following asymptotic result for the extremal eigenvalues.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that the deformed model M_N is without spike i.e. $r = 0$. Let $k \geq 0$ be a fixed integer.*

1. *The first largest eigenvalues $\lambda_{1+k}(M_N)$ converge almost surely to the right endpoint of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$.*
2. *If $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-) = 0$ that is when $c = 1$ and either $0 \in \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ or $0 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ and $g_\nu(0) \leq -\frac{1}{\sigma^2}$, then the last smallest eigenvalues $\lambda_{n-k}(M_N)$ converge almost surely to zero.*

3. *If $u_1 > 0$ (which implies $\Phi(u_1^-) > 0$) then the last smallest eigenvalues $\lambda_{n-k}(M_N)$ converge almost surely to $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-)$.*

Proof of Proposition 4.2:
Recalling that $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}) = \cup_{l=1}^{p}[\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l^-), \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)]$, from (4.10), one has that, for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\limsup_N \lambda_1(M_N) \leq \Phi_{\sigma,\nu}(v_p^+) + \epsilon] = 1.$$

But as $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_p^+)$ is a boundary point of $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})$, the number of eigenvalues of M_N falling into $[\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_p^+) - \epsilon, \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_p^+) + \epsilon]$ tends almost surely to infinity as $N \to \infty$. Thus, almost surely,

$$\liminf_N \lambda_{1+k}(M_N) \geq \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_p^+) - \epsilon.$$

1) follows by letting $\epsilon \to 0$.
The proofs of 2) and 3) are similar to the proof of 1) using the fact that in these cases (4.11) holds.
□

In the spiked case, one can deduce from Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 4.1 the following

Theorem 4.2. *For any $j = 1, \ldots, J$, we denote by $n_{j-1}+1, \ldots, n_{j-1}+k_j$ the descending ranks of $|a_j(N)|^2$ among the eigenvalues of $A_N A_N^*$.*

1) *If $\theta_j \in \mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ (i.e. $\in \Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}$), the k_j eigenvalues $(\lambda_{n_{j-1}+i}(M_N), 1 \leq i \leq k_j)$ converge almost surely outside the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ towards $\rho_{\theta_j} = \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(\theta_j)$.*

2) *If $\theta_j \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$, then we let $[u_{l_j}, v_{l_j}]$ (with $1 \leq l_j \leq p$) be the connected component of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ which contains θ_j.*

    a) *If θ_j is on the right of any connected component of $\mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ which is included in $[u_{l_j}, v_{l_j}]$ then the k_j eigenvalues $(\lambda_{n_{j-1}+i}(M_N), 1 \leq i \leq k_j)$ converge almost surely to $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^-)$ which is a boundary point of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$.*
    If $u_{l_j} > 0$ (which is always true if $l_j \neq 1$) and if θ_j is on the left of any connected component of $\mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ which is included in $[u_{l_j}, v_{l_j}]$ then the k_j eigenvalues $(\lambda_{n_{j-1}+i}(M_N), 1 \leq i \leq k_j)$ converge almost surely to $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_{l_j}^-)$ which is a boundary point of the support of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$.

    b) *If $l_j = 1$ and $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_1^-) = 0$ and if θ_j is on the left of any connected component of $\mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ which is included in $[u_1, v_1]$ then the k_j eigenvalues $(\lambda_{n_{j-1}+i}(M_N), 1 \leq i \leq k_j)$ converge almost surely to 0.*

    c) *If θ_j is between two connected components of $\mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ which are included in $[u_{l_j}, v_{l_j}]$ then the k_j eigenvalues $(\lambda_{n_{j-1}+i}(M_N), 1 \leq i \leq k_j)$ converge almost surely to the α_j-th quantile of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ (that is to q_{α_j} defined by $\alpha_j = \mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}(]-\infty, q_{\alpha_j}])$) where α_j is such that $\alpha_j = 1 - \lim_N \frac{n_{j-1}}{N} = \nu(]-\infty, \theta_j])$.*

The proof of Theorem 4.2 follows the lines of the proof of Theorem 8.1 [9]. We include it for the reader's convenience. First, from Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 4.1, we readily deduce the following

Corollary 4.1. *Let us fix* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that*

$$2\epsilon < \min\left\{\min_{l=1,\dots,p-1}[\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_{l+1}^-) - \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)], d(\rho_{\theta_i}, \mathit{supp}\ (\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c})),\right.$$

$$\left. d(\rho_{\theta_i}, \rho_{\theta_j}), \theta_i \neq \theta_j \ \mathit{in}\ \Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c}\right\}$$

Let u *be in* $\Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c} \cup \{v_l, l = 1,\dots,m\}$ *(resp. in* $\Theta_{\sigma,\nu,c} \cup (\{u_l, l = 1,\dots,m\} \cap]0;+\infty[)$*). Let us choose* $\delta > 0$ *small enough so that for large* N, $[u+\delta; u+2\delta]$ *(resp.* $[u-2\delta; u-\delta]$*) is included in* $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma,\nu,c} \cap]0;+\infty[$ *and for any* $0 \leq \delta' \leq 2\delta$, $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u+\delta') - \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u^+) < \epsilon$ *(resp.* $\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u^-) - \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\delta') < \epsilon$*). Let* $i_N = i_N(u)$ *be such that*

$$\lambda_{i_N+1}(A_N A_N^*) < u + \delta \ \ \mathit{and}\ \ \lambda_{i_N}(A_N A_N^*) > u + 2\delta$$

(resp. $\lambda_{i_N+1}(A_N A_N^*) < u - 2\delta$ *and* $\lambda_{i_N}(A_N A_N^*) > u - \delta$*). Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\big[\lambda_{i_N+1}(M_N) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u+\delta) \ \ \mathit{and}\ \ \lambda_{i_N}(M_N) > \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u^+)+\epsilon, \ \mathit{for\ all\ large}\ N\big] = 1.$$

(resp. $\mathbb{P}\big[\lambda_{i_N+1}(M_N) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u^-)-\epsilon$ *and* $\lambda_{i_N}(M_N) > \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u-\delta)$ *for all large* $N\big] = 1.$*)*

Proof of Theorem 4.2

1) Choosing $u = \theta_j$ in Corollary 4.1 gives, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\rho_{\theta_j} - \epsilon \leq \lambda_{n_{j-1}+k_j}(M_N) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{n_{j-1}+1}(M_N) \leq \rho_{\theta_j} + \epsilon, \ \text{for large } N \quad (4.12)$$

holds almost surely. Hence

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq k_j, \quad \lambda_{n_{j-1}+i}(M_N) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \rho_{\theta_j}.$$

2) a) We only focus on the case where θ_j is on the right of any connected component of supp(ν) which is included in $[u_{l_j}, v_{l_j}]$ since the other case may be considered with similar arguments. Let us consider the set $\{\theta_{j_0} > \ldots > \theta_{j_p}\}$ of all the θ_i's being in $[u_{l_j}, v_{l_j}]$ and on the right of any connected component of supp(ν) which is included in $[u_{l_j}, v_{l_j}]$. Note that we have for all large N, for any $0 \leq h \leq p$,

$$n_{j_h-1} + k_{j_h} = n_{j_h}$$

and θ_{j_0} is the largest eigenvalue of $A_N A_N^*$ which is lower than v_{l_j}. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Applying Corollary 4.1 with $u = v_{l_j}$, we get that, almost surely,

$$\lambda_{n_{j_0-1}+1}(M_N) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+)+\epsilon \text{ and } \lambda_{n_{j_0-1}}(M_N) > \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+)+\epsilon \text{ for all large } N.$$

Now, almost surely, the number of eigenvalues of M_N being in $]\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+) - \epsilon, \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+) + \epsilon]$ should tend to infinity when N goes to infinity. Since almost surely for all large N, $\lambda_{n_{j_0-1}}(M_N) > \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+) + \epsilon$ and $\lambda_{n_{j_0-1}+1}(M_N) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+) + \epsilon$, we should have

$$\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+) - \epsilon \leq \lambda_{n_{j_p-1}+k_{j_p}}(M_N) \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_{n_{j_0-1}+1}(M_N) < \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+) + \epsilon.$$

Hence, we deduce that: $\forall 0 \leq l \leq p$ and $\forall 1 \leq i \leq k_{j_p}$, $\quad \lambda_{n_{j_p-1}+i}(M_N) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+)$. The result then follows since $j \in \{j_0, \ldots, j_p\}$.
b) In this case, θ_i is one of the finite number of lowest eigenvalues of A_N. Then b) readily follows from the fact that the number of eigenvalues of M_N being in $[0, \epsilon]$ should tend to infinity when N goes to infinity.
c) Let $\alpha_j = 1 - \lim_N \frac{n_{j-1}}{N} = \nu(] - \infty, \theta_j])$. Denote by Q (resp. Q_N) the distribution function of $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$ (resp. of the spectral measure of M_N). Q is continuous on $\mathbb{R}$ and strictly increasing on each interval $[\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_l^-), \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_l^+)], 1 \leq l \leq m$. From Corollary 1.1 and the hypothesis on θ_j, $\alpha_j \in]Q(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_{l_j}^-)), Q(\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+))[$ and there exists a unique $q_j \in]\Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(u_{l_j}^-), \Phi_{\sigma,\nu,c}(v_{l_j}^+)[$ such that $Q(q_j) = \alpha_j$. Moreover, Q is strictly increasing in a neighborhood of q_i.
Let $\epsilon > 0$. From the almost sure convergence of μ_{M_N} to $\mu_{\sigma,\nu,c}$, we deduce

$$Q_N(q_j + \epsilon) \underset{N \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} Q(q_j + \epsilon) > \alpha_j, \quad \text{a.s..}$$

From the definition of α_j, it follows that for large N, $N, N-1, \ldots, n_{j-1} + k_j, \ldots, n_{j-1} + 1$ belong to the set $\{k, \lambda_k(M_n) \leq q_j + \epsilon\}$ and thus,

$$\limsup_{N \longrightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n_{j-1}+1}(M_N) \leq q_j + \epsilon.$$

In the same way, since $Q_N(q_j - \epsilon) \longrightarrow_{N \to \infty} Q(q_j - \epsilon) < \alpha_j$,

$$\liminf_{N \longrightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n_{j-1}+k_j}(M_N) \geq q_j - \epsilon.$$

Thus, the k_j eigenvalues $(\lambda_{n_{j-1}+i}(M_N),\ 1 \leq i \leq k_j)$ converge almost surely to q_j. $\square$

References

[1] Z. D. Bai and J. W. Silverstein. Exact separation of eigenvalues of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices. *Ann. Probab.*, 27(3):1536–1555, 1999.

[2] Z. Bai and J.W. Silverstein. No eigenvalues outside the support of the limiting spectral distribution of information-plus-noise type matrices. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications* 1(1) 2012, pp. 1150004.

[3] F. Benaych-Georges. Rectangular random matrices, related convolution *Probab. Theory Related Fields* Vol. 144, no. 3 (2009) 471–515.

[4] F. Benaych-Georges, S. Belinschi and A. Guionnet. Regularization by free additive convolution, square and rectangular cases. *Complex Anal. Oper. Theory* Vol. 3, no. 3 (2009) 611–660.

[5] P. Biane. On the free convolution with a semi-circular distribution. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 46(3):705–718, 1997.

[6] P. Biane, and F. Lehner. Computation of some examples of Brown's spectral measure in free probability; *Colloq. Math.* 90 (2), 181-211.(2001)

[7] M. Capitaine, C. Donati-Martin. Free Wishart Processes *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, vol. 18, No 2, 2005) 413-438.

[8] M. Capitaine, C. Donati-Martin, and D. Féral. The largest eigenvalues of finite rank deformation of large Wigner matrices: convergence and nonuniversality of the fluctuations. *Ann. Probab.*, 37(1):1–47, 2009.

[9] M. Capitaine, C. Donati-Martin, D. Féral and M. Février. Free convolution with a semi-circular distribution and eigenvalues of spiked deformations of Wigner matrices. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 16: 1750–1792, 2011.

[10] R. Couillet, J. W. Silverstein, Z. Bai, and M. Debbah. Eigen-Inference for Energy Estimation of Multiple Sources. to appear in *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory.*

[11] R.B. Dozier and J.W. Silverstein. On the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of large dimensional information-plus-noise type matrices. *J. Multivariate. Anal.*, vol. 98, no. 4: 678–694 , 2007.

[12] R.B. Dozier and J.W. Silverstein. Analysis of the limiting spectral distribution of large dimensional information-plus-noise type matrices. *J. Multivariate. Anal.*, vol. 98, no. 6: 1099–1122 , 2007.

[13] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix analysis.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. Corrected reprint of the 1985 original.

[14] P. Vallet, P. Loubaton and X. Mestre. Improved Subspace Estimation for Multivariate Observations of High Dimension: The Deterministic Signal Case. 2010 Available at http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/1002.3234.

[15] P. Loubaton and P. Vallet. Almost sure localization of the eigenvalues in a Gaussian information-plus-noise model. Application to the spiked models 2010 Available at http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/1009.5807.

[16] J. Xie. The convergence on spectrum of sample covariance matrices for information-plus-noise type data. *Appl. Math. J. Chinese Univ.*, vol. 27 (2): 181-191 , 2012.